K.G. KARRAS – C.C. WOLHUTER
(eds)

INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOK OF TEACHER EDUCATION WORLD-WIDE

Issues and Challenges

Volume I & Volume II

PREFACE: GASTON MIALARET

ATHENS -ATRAPOS EDITIONS 2010

Table of contents

VOLUME I

EUROPE

AFRICA

VOLUME II

ASIA

AMERICA

OCEANIA

Teacher Education in Indonesia: Development and Challenges

Raihani and Bambang Sumintono[1]

Introduction

Following the political reform in 1998 marked by the falling of the Suharto's regime (New Order), Indonesian education has undergone a major significant reform in almost all spheres of the field. Although the reform in school management had started since 1999 when the regional autonomy law (Law No. 22, 1999) was issued, it has just had a stronger basis on the new Education Law in 2003. In this current law, as Raihani (2007a) observes, the reform encompasses three major areas of education, i.e. the philosophy and objectives, management, and curriculum. National education is now aimed at developing each student's potential to become people with faith and piety towards God the Only One, good morality, good health, knowledge, intelligence, creativity, independence, and to become democratic and responsible citizens [authors' translation] (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2003c, article 2). There is an emphasis on religious and moral values, intellectual competences, and democratic values. While the first three domains of objectives (religious, moral and intellectual) are characteristics repeatedly mentioned in the previous education laws (Poerbakawatja, 1970), the explicit mention of democratic values is notable. Such a mention is a resemblance of what had been happening around the issue of the law, which is the major political change from authoritarianism to democracy. The law suggests that students need to be enlightened to the democratic values and practices, strengthening the relationship between education and politics (Azra, 2002), and indicating that schools were a crucial locus for educating children to become democratic citizens, who contributed to constructing and sustaining a democratic country (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2002).

In terms of management, Indonesian education has now shifted from a centralist to decentralist approach, in which significant authority and responsibility are transferred from

[1] Raihani, Ph.D., Lecturer of UIN Suska Riau, Indonesia, raihani@arts.uwa.edu.au.
Bambang Sumintono, Ph.D., Lecturer of Educational Management, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM), bambang@utm.edu.my.

the central to local district governments. Decentralisation of management was taken as a prescribed cure for the existing problem of low quality educational processes and outcomes (Bjork, 2006). It is indeed a global movement, and in the global scene is frequently set by funding providers such as the World Bank as one of the major requirements of loans for the third-world countries like Indonesia (Hanson, 2006). As a consequence, since 1999 community-based education has been promoted throughout the country, and a type of school-based management has been implemented with the target to empower and involve local communities in the process of education (Umaedi, 1999). The ultimate objective of this new management approach is to produce better educational outcomes, even though criticisms upon its conceptualisation and implementation have been voiced (Bandur, 2008; Raihani, 2007c; Sumintono, 2009). Above all, decentralisation has been regarded by some experts as merely the state's withdrawal from financial responsibilities to help schools (Wong, 2006), particularly private schools, even though in the Indonesian case, government has recently started to help private schools based on the student population.

In regards to curriculum, the Indonesian education authority, in 2003, introduced a new curriculum called initially *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi* (KBK: Competency-Based Curriculum), and began to implement it in 2004 after a series of trials in several selected schools (Raihani, 2007a; 2007c). Therefore, the official name for this curriculum was *Kurikulum 2004* (the 2004 curriculum). According to the Ministry of National Education (MNE) (2003a; 2003b), this new curriculum put an emphasis on standardised competences that the students were to achieve and on a greater authority for the school stakeholders to participate in the curriculum development. This new curriculum framework, however did not comply with the decentralisation spirit in that it still had too detailed prescriptions for school teachers to implement. It prescribed four basic elements including nationally standardised competences, basic competences, indicators of achievement, and main topics. In this sense, teachers were still regarded as the mere implementers of the curriculum and were not significantly involved in its development. Therefore, in 2006 a new type of the curriculum was introduced and named as *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (KTSP, meaning: School-Based Curriculum). Whilst the competency approach is maintained, this 2006 curriculum only prescribed two main components, i.e. nationally standardised competences and basic competences – suggesting that the major responsibility of further developing the curriculum is laid on individual schools and teachers. Facilitating this new role of teachers, the government encourages every school to have or revitalise teacher support groups [*Kelompok Kerja Guru* (KKG) and *Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran* (MGMP)] based on subject matters. Whilst it is expected that teachers play an active role in developing their curriculum and instruction, the practice of

these support groups have been relied only on few teachers who are regarded as source persons for other teachers. In some cases, these source persons develop a one-for-all curriculum.

The three aspects of educational reform in Indonesia, as explained above, imply the very vital roles of teachers in such a reform. Their active roles are shaped by their education and experiences. In other words, pre-service and in-service educations of teachers contribute significantly to their quality, not only of teaching, but also of believing and behaving as teachers. In this context, this chapter describes teacher education in Indonesia, and discusses issues related to it. First, it depicts briefly an historical account of teacher education from the Dutch colonial era to the current situation. Second, it examines the impact of the new teacher law issued in 2005 on the improvement of teacher quality and education. As part of this second section, the most recent programme of teacher certification is discussed. Finally, this chapter discusses potential problems in teacher education, and outlines several prospects that might occur in the Indonesia's current political and economical situation.

1. A Brief History of Indonesian Teacher Education

The Dutch colonial government introduced a formal schooling in East Indies (Indonesia) in the 19th century, with complicated and segregated systems for local people (*pribumi*), Europeans and other foreigners (Djajadiningrat, n. d.). As the number of students and schools increased, government established a teacher education school (called *Normaalschool* and *Kweekschool*) in several places to meet the demands for teachers for especially *pribumi's* primary schools (Lee, 1995; van der Veur, 1969). The students of the *Normaalschool and Kweekschool* were those who had completed five years elementary education either in the European or *pribumi* schools to receive teacher education for four years. The *Kweekschool* later extended to add two more years for students to finish, and used Ducth as a language of instruction. Some local people who graduated from the *Kweekschool* might continue education for another three years in *Hogere Kweekschool* (advance study of teacher education) (Poerbakawatja, 1970). Graduates from *Normalschool* taught at elementary schools for *pribumi*, meanwhile *Kweekschool* graduates that had better quality were involved in the European and eastern foreigner elementary schools teaching Bahasa Indonesia or even Mathematics and Geography using the Dutch language. This was also the case for many *Hogere Kweekschool* graduates. For secondary school educators, most of them were the Dutch nationals who graduated in Holland, with only a few Indonesians recruited. As the number of students of these

teacher education institutions was strictly controlled by the colonial government, some *pribumi* established their own schools for teacher education, namely *Taman Siswa and Muhammadiyah*. These two institutions provided primary education for *pribumi*, and teacher education to meet the needs for *pribumi* teachers. Table 1 shows the school, teacher, and student population from 1940, 1950, to 1955. At the time, the higher the level of education, the smaller the proportion of *pribumi* teachers and students (Djajadiningrat, n. d).

Table 1. Population of School, Teachers and Students in the Colonial era and eary Independent Indonesia

Level of School	1940	1950	1955
Primary School			
School	18 091	24 725	31 802
Teachers	40 583	83 060	111 784
Students	2 021 890	4 977 364	8 624 159
Junior Secondary			
School	114	856	2 542
Teachers	982	5 210	20 840
Students	21 875	116 021	430 071
Senior Secondary			
School	30	98	453
Teachers	625	1 644	7 374
Students	4 660	22 653	78 347

Source: Poerbakawatja, 1970

In 1942, Dutch colonialisation ended in Indonesia, and the Japanese started a new era in which they promised to liberate Indonesia to become an independent nation. Their promise was never kept, and Indonesia's independence was achieved through a bloody struggle. In the Japanese era, however, the Dutch ecucation system was abolished. The Japanese gave wider opportunities to *pribumi* to receive education. Since the Dutch teachers had been banned from teaching because of either escaping from the Japanese or becoming prisoners, the *pribumi* teachers had to replace them. In this situation, many elementary teachers were forced to teach at higher level classes. It is important to note, however, that both the Dutch and Japanese colonial governments practiced a centralised education system, and their main intention was to maximise benefits for the rulers (Poerbakawatja, 1970).

After the Dutch recognition of Indonesia's independence in 1949, the student enrollment and the number of school rose dramatically. This change forced the new government to take emergency action to produce more teachers, especially for primary schools.

Poerbakawatja (1970) explains tha: in the 1951 there were more than 138 thousand primary school teachers needed to accommodate the rise of students that reached five millions. However, the capacity of the existing teacher education schools across Indonesia to produce that number of teachers was very limited, i.e. producing only around four thousand teachers every year. To fulfil this need government developed short courses for teaching in many districts for in-service teachers who held at least six years basic education to receive a teaching certificate. Later, these emergency courses were institutionalised into more than 350 teacher education schools called SGB (*Sekolah Guru Bawah*, lower teacher school). Although this programme was believed to be successful in terms of producing quantitatively the required teachers in a short period of time, this crash programme was widely criticised because of failing to equip them with a full academic education to enable them to become good teachers, and of the limited selection process (Nielsen, 2003). However, this era witnessed the teache' profession for the first time in Indonesian history as widely available for every member of society regardless of their social class and status.

Another challenge for the new republic was to supply teachers for junior and senior seconcary schools. Starting from 1954, government established institutions of teacher education at tertiary level in order to meet this demand, and changed them to institutes of teacher education in 1963 in several big cities called IKIP (*Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, Institute for Teacher Training and Education) (Poerbakawatja, 1970). In other provinces, in several general universities, Education faculties were established incorporating lesser departments than IKIPs. Both IKIPs and Faculties of Education in these general universities had served as the main supplier of teachers for junior and senior secondary schools. This was a notable improvement in terms of meeting teacher qualification in which holding university degree became one of the requirements for teaching at the post-primary level.

Because of the state economic hardship in the Old Order, since 1963 there had been significant changes related to the recruitment of student teachers. Previously, those who wanted to become teachers through SGB or IKIPs were only top students in their secondary education. The government provided full scholarship and boarding during study, and they had a government guaranteed position as civil servant teachers after graduation. Post-1963, however, the privileges were no longer available for student teachers, and obviously studying at SGB and IKIPS was no longer attractive for high achievers. This later situation had an impact on the input quality.

Another remarkable change in the New Order Indonesia (1966-1998) in teacher education started in 1974. Triggered by university students' demonstration and backed by the raising oil reverue, government launched an *Inpres* (presidential instruction) programme

with the objective to establish one primary school in each village. Duflo (2004) notes that during 1974-1978 more than 61 thousand primary schools were built based on the programme. As a result, the primary schooling participation rate rose by 37% (to become 95%) within the 25 year period from 1969 (Purwadi & Muljoatmojo, 2000). This initiative doubled student population relatively rapidly to the total of nearly 20 million primary school students. During this time, the teacher education schools at the secondary school level called SPG (*Sekolah Pendidikan Guru*) increased their capacity to educate more students, and private teacher schools spread because the government had to recruit hundreds of thousand new civil servant teachers to meet the demand.

Table 2. New Primary School Teachers appointed by the Inpres Programme during New Order

Years	1967-1973	1974-1978	1979-1983	1984-1988	1989-1993	1994-1998
Teachers Appointed	18000	263000	415500	233174	65150	29200

Source: Power point presentation of The Director General of Quality Improvement of Teachersand Education Staff, Ministry of National Education, Indonesia, 2007

Following the development in the primary school enrollment, the participation rates in higher schooling also rose significantly to 58% for junior secondary schooling, and 35% for senior secondary school in 1984 (Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000). Anticipating the next enrollment wave, government in early 1980s made a crash programme for producing Natural Sciences and Mathematics teachers for junior and senior secondary schools. Instead of increasing the IKIP capacity to prepare and graduate more teachers for these teaching subjects, government instructed seven big public universities (all in Java) which did not have education faculty to meet the needs for qualified teachers with three years university education (called the Diploma 3 programme) for six batches. In order to get the best candidates for this programme, the universities selected new students through a university entry examination, providing them with scholarship and living allowance, and guaranteeing a position as civil servant teachers. The crash programme was criticised by IKIP's people that the programme would not be able to equip students with pedagogical knowledge and skills required to produce good teachers. Despite this criticism, however, the programme initiation reflected the government's attitude to IKIPs as if they were not seen as effective institutions for producing good teachers. The programme had an impact on the changes in IKIP's curriculum for preparing teachers, mainly in the fields of

Sciences and Mathematics in which subject matter specialists were given a bigger proportion than they were before.

The introduction of the Education Lawin 1989 (Law 2/1989) brought another significant change in teacher education. It mandated that primary school teachers should have two years university education (called with Diploma 2 programme) prior to their teaching service. This policy led to the rapidly closing down of the SPGs nationally shortly, and gave a shock to the teaching profession. The in-service teachers were required to take the designed university upgracing courses either in nearest IKIPs from their workplace or in a distance mode provided by *Universitas Terbuka* (Open University). The reason for this was very clear — teacher candidates need to learn more pedagogical knowledge and acquire more skills to become qualified primary teachers. As indicated by Nielsen (2003), this initiative was a gigantic task expecting to involve 800 thousand primary school teachers. However, it focused more on increasing teachers' qualification than on improving their quality. The upgrading process, as Nielsen criticised, was far from effective in improving teacher quality as shown by the fact that teaching modules and teacher trainers' experiences were not contextualised into the daily environment and challenges teachers had usually faced in their schools.

The political change in 1998, as noted earlier, brought remarkable changes in Indonesian education. In teacher education, it was not clear if there was a close connection between the political reform and the change of six IKIPs from Institutes of Education to Universities of Education in 1999 marked by a President Decree 93/1999 (Pembaruan, 2003). What was clear was that the objective of such a change was to improve the quality of those tertiary teacher training and enable them to produce better quality teachers. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI: Indonesian Education University) Bandung is one of the transformed institutes, and enjoyed the new status and a bigger amount of budget from the government. Although there has not been comprehensive research of the graduates' quality of such universities relative to that of the previous institutes, the enrollment rates have increased significanty, demonstrating them as one of the famously intended universities. Universitas Negeri Padang (UNP: Padang State University), for instance, educated no less than 25 000 students in the academic year 2007/2008, almost three times beyond the number of enroled students in 1998/1999, which was only about 9 000 (Kompas, 2008). After all, the new universities offer more programmes and specialisations of teaching and other educational professions for students to learn than the previous institutes did.

It is notable that, besides the new universities and Faculties of Education in many universities across the archipelago, there are other institutions which provide teacher training and education, i.e. Faculties of Tarbiyah (Islamic education) attached to Insitute

Agama Islam Negeri (AIN: State Institute for Islamic Studies) or Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN: State Islamic University) or other religious colleges. Whilst the former universities and faculties were administered by the Ministry of National Education (MNE), the latter (religious) faculties were affiliated to the Ministry of Religion (MR). All these institutions, under both the MNE and MR, are now classified into Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan (LPTK: the Teacher Training Institutions). The Faculties of Islamic Education are aimed at producing teachers who serve Islamic schools (*madrasah*), and teachers who teach Islamic religion subjects in general schools (under the MNE). There have been issues and difficulties in terms of coordination and budgets overwhelming this type of dualism of the teacher training system and of the national education system in general. For instance, since the status of the MR is legally classified into the central government's officials (based on the regional autonomy law in 1999), it is difficult for local governments to provide assistance to madrasahs and their teachers as they do to the MNE schools and teachers. Criticism over these by education experts and Islamic school teachers have been sounded, but government seems to have failed to respond them appropriately[2]. According to the MNE statistics in 2005, madrasah constitutes 17.6% of all schools in Indonesia from primary to secondary levels.

2. New Teacher Law and Teacher Certification

In 2005, the Indonesian government issued a new teacher law, 14/2005, which puts emphasis on teachers' qualifications, quality, and welfare. This law, which was proposed by *Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia* (PGRI: Indonesian Teacher Union) years before, includes not only school teachers as the legal subjects, but also university lecturers. In relation to school teachers, one of the important points of the law is that teachers must have at least four year post-secondary education (Bachelor Degree or Diploma 4), as one of the essential requirements, before becoming eligible teachers, including at the primary level. In 2006, according to a report by the MNE and the World Bank, of about 1 250 000 primary school teachers, only about 200 000 hold a bachelor degree (Jalal et al., 2009: 7). The majority of them are only senior secondary school and Diploma 2 graduates. This

[2] Raihani & Lyn Parker's research-in-progress (2009) on *madrasah* governance has shown the uniformed concerns by *madrasah* teachers of being "step-childed" by the local governments due to their status as vertically government's officials. But it seems to be up to the local governments' political wills whether to act indiscriminately over the schools and *madrasahs* under their jurisdiction. The majority of them, however, have hidden under the 22/1999 law declaring *madrasahs* and their teachers do not deserve the assistance as their counterparts of the MNE do.

means that government must work hard to further educate them in order to meet the new law's requirements. Therefore, the accreditation programme of teachers through furthering their education has taken place in many assigned universities with major financial support from the government.

Another essential criterion for an incumbent teacher to be eligible for becoming a school teacher, according to the new law which is explicated further by the *Regulation of the Minister of National Education 18/2007*, is to pass the portfolio examination in the certification programme started in 2007 (Jalal et al., 2009). This certification programme requires teachers to meet certain criteria including academic qualification, teaching experience, qualification-subject matching, and teaching workload (Trianto & Tutik, 2007). All of these criteria are centered on the new concept of teaching competencies, namely personal competencies, pedagogical competencies, professional competencies, and social competencies (Trianto & Tutik, 2007; Yamin, 2006). Each cluster of the competencies is assessed equally from the portfolio that the teachers submit to the certification committee in their own zone. All these competences have also to be achieved by students of LPTKs before they receive their qualification. However, if they wish to receive the certificate, they have to acquire an additional 36 credits at the determined LPTKs. Those who pass the examination of either the in-service or pre-service teacher certification will receive the certificate and, hence, significant additional incentive from government, which is equal to their basic salary for civil servant teachers or about Rp. 1.5 millions (equivalent to US$ 150 on the conversion rate US$ 1 = Rp. 10,000) for non-civil servants. This certification process for incumbent teachers will last until all the teachers are certified or estimated until 2015.

According to government, the certification programme is one strategy to improve teachers' quality equipped with the above mentioned competencies (Jalal et al., 2009). This new policy, however, has been criticized for its ambiguous concept and handicapped implementation (Raihani, 2007b). The ambiguity lays on the objective of the policy whether to improve the quality of teachers or only to increase their incentive. Criticism over the low wages received by teachers was the background of the new teacher law, and, therefore, it is assumed that increased salary is the main motive of the certification programme. This assumption has been strengthened by the fact that Akta IV (Certificate Four), a certificate for school teachers obtained as a result of attending teacher education, is not considered. In other words, those who already received Akta IV still have to pass the portfolio examination to become 'certified teachers'. This implies a repeated distrust by the government to the quality of LPTK graduates.

The question of "what next" is another criticism of the ambiguity of the teacher certification programme. Whilst professional development of teachers is a never-ending

process for those who are committed to the teaching profession, the new programme does not indicate sustainable strategies in improving the quality of the certified teachers. In the eyes of teachers, according to Raihani's conversation with many teachers[3], the certification outcome is no more than the incentive promised to them. There is no information of what would happen to certified teachers if they did not perform well after the certification. Will their certificate be cancelled? Or will they have to renew their certificate after a period of time, and submit another portfolio for examination? The answers to these "what next" questions are not yet clear.

In the course of implementation, one of the alarming problems is that several types of data falsifications were found in many teachers' portfolios. An independent team for monitoring and evaluation of the teacher certification found 87% data falsifications by teachers ranging from signature, identity certificate to date falsifications (Tim Independen Korsorsium Sertifikasi Guru, 2008). This could be driven by several factors. First, the teachers are not ready to be examined as there was only a short period of time between the socialisation and examination phases, particularly for the first wave participants in 2007. Therefore, they did not have plenty of time to prepare and collect all the required documents they might have since the beginning of their teaching career. Second, the teachers had not indeed documented (or neglected) all the certificates they have had previously because they did not expect to experience this certification. Third, the teachers hardly participated in activities which provided certificates and documentations or in other words they have merely been "teaching" teachers. Fourth, there is a big question of their morality for doing such falsifications. This last factor should be taken seriously into account as this reflects how moral education is ineffective in shaping their characters, and how this morality might be transferred into their students. Above all, however, certification is only a means to an end (Jalal et al., 2009), and per se it does little to create effective teachers, but has benefits to improve professional standards and teacher recruitment (Duncan-Poitier, 2007).

As mentioned previously, the new teacher law stressed on, besides their qualification and quality, teachers' welfare. A type of professional incentive or allowance is mandated by law, and government seems to take it and act upon it very seriously. The minimum of 20% of the national budget mandated by the education law 2003 has been met. Besides the certification which results in the receipt by teachers of the professional incentive, their basic salaries and other incentives (especially for civil servant teachers) have been annually and significantly increased. Many local governments have also provided some types

[3] Raihani was a fadilitator for the Teacher Certification Socialisation Program in Sumatra Zone and had an opportunity to talk with *madrasah*'s teachers in 2007.

of allowance for their teachers both civil servant and non-civil servant teachers, depending on their budget capability. However, the gap between civil servant and non-civil servant teachers in wages is still very wide. Raihani and Parker's research-in-progress (2009) indicates that civil servant teachers in Yogyakarta could receive three to four times more than non-civil servant teachers.

3. Problems and Prospects of Indonesia's Teacher Education

Teacher quality is still the main concern of today's Indonesian education. Several surveys in the last thirty years regarding teachers' quality conducted by the MNE showed results that are far from satisfactory. There are several factors relating to teacher quality in Indonesia, which include the quality of pre-service education, the teacher recruitment and selection, the state bureaucratic environment (Poerbakawatja, 1970; Beeby, 1979; Nielsen, 2003), and the uneven distribution of teachers across the country (Jalal & Hendarman, 2009). The pre-service teacher education quality in Indonesia needs to be improved. According to Sutjipto at al. (2001), there has been a tendency of expansion and proliferation of private teacher education institutions since in 1980s, which brought about the uncontrolled quality of teacher education. The number of the graduates boomed, and their quality in terms of academic and personal competences as well as teaching skills was poor. At the same time, there was no consistent mechanism to recruit teachers as the need for teachers at the time was extremely high. Until now, teacher education institutions, both public and private, have not shown significant improvement in their education process, which influences the quality of their graduates. Too much emphasis on theories and overloaded materials are amongst the underlying problems, forcing the graduates to start learning the real encounters once they are in the workplace. From several pieces of research[4], the facilitation programmes either by government or by non-governmental organisations seem to have demonstrated a more significant impact on teaching effectiveness than teachers' pre-service education, even though this statement needs more research confirmation. Another issue is that the teacher upgrading programmes through either onsite or online mode has been run for teachers to obtain merely the cer-

[4] Raihani has been involved in researching community participation in education in Indonesia in both general and Islamic contexts. Publications will come out from these studies. It is found that facilitation programmes done by the government or NGOs do matter in equipping teachers with new knowledge and skills required for the new spectrum of school-based management. In many cases, this type of in-service training is accompanied by the provision of a supporting fund to stimulate schools' activities.

tificates of higher qualification, not to improve their quality. As noted by Nielsen (2003), the modules used by the teachers "revealed their theoretical and irrelevant nature" to their need. Therefore, ineffective learning processes and fake evaluation can be found in many upgrading programmes.

Recruitment and selection of teachers have been a major problem in improving teacher quality in Indonesia. Currently, except for *madrasah* teachers, the recruitment of civil servant teachers is transferred to the authority of local governments. There is little evidence that local government set fixed and accountable criteria for the recruitment processes (Jalal & Hendarman, 2009; Jalal et al., 2009). Experiences show that the selection examination does not relate at all to the teaching profession, but merely to the profession as a civil servant. When the civil servant teacher recruitment has failed to show an effective recruitment and selection system, the non-civil servant teacher recruitment system is left to individual schools to decide. Some established schools have more robust mechanisms of teacher recruitment, but many more schools do not.

The state bureaucratic environment can be traced back to the past sixty years. During the Old Order Indonesian (1945-1965) education's main task was to support unity of the country, and one of the salient practices was to teach nationalism. This situation deteriorated after 1957 when Sukarno declared the *Manipol*, where many civil servants including teachers had to join "retooling" programme which in fact was indoctrination for the purpose of the ruler (Feith, 1963). The programme systematically changed the direction of education to cater for political purposes and restricted the freedom of speech and thought; this led to demoralization of teachers as well as lecturers at IKIPs (Lee, 1995; Tilaar, 2000). From that moment, teacher quality has been measured mainly by their obedience to their superior, wearing uniform and taking part in a regular flag raising ceremony (Bjork, 2003, 2005). The reform era particularly after the implementation of the regional autonomy policy, however, has shown improvement in this aspect, but changing culture and mindset is not an easy task. Research found that there are many teachers who wait for the directives from superiors before acting upon anything (Rubiannor, 2003).

Lack of teachers quantitatively is generally thought as a major problem in Indonesia. This is true in the era of the new order, but not for the current situation, at least according to the most recent study by a World Bank team in corporation with the MNE (Jalal & Hendarman, 2009). The team found that with the current policy of student teacher ratio (STR), there are more than sufficient numbers of teachers than that of students, but there is significant inequality in the deployment of teachers. Generally, 81% of schools have an oversupply of teachers, while some 13% are short in teachers (Jalal & Hendarman, 2009: 27). This means that there is an uneven distribution of teachers across the country. This does not mean, however, that all the teachers are qualified for teaching. As indicat-

ed earlier, the majority of primary teachers are senior secondary and D2 graduates. They need to upgrade their qualifications to become qualified teachers.

Besides some chronical problems described above, there are prospects for teacher education in Indonesia to improve. These prospects are provided mainly by the political changes that have been occurring since the reform era where democratisation entailing a stronger people's control over government's policies is enhanced. Through this democratic mechanism, the voices of education stakeholders are heard, and their roles are acknowledged. The 2003 Education Law and the 2005 Teacher Law are examples of how people were involved in these law making processes. The other provision of these prospects is Indonesia's economical growth which remains stable despite the global crisis that hit almost all countries in the world in 2009. This situation will enable government to honour its commitment to the provision of a better national and local budget for education. The prospects include that the teaching profession has become an attractive profession to many people. As mentioned earlier, teacher education universities have now received more students enrolled. This cannot be separated from the provision of increased wages for teachers so that teachers, particularly with the civil servant status, earn more than a sufficient salary for their daily needs. Another prospect is that efforts to improve the quality of teaching at the teacher education institutions are continuously done, which include the improvement of their facilities, the development of human resources by sending more lecturers to study abroad, and the innovation of the management and curricula. In addition, many donor institutions such as the World Bank, USAID and AusAID have consistently assisted Indonesia's education, particularly in the improvement of teacher quality through training and workshops. Furthermore, as shown in research, enthusiasm of teachers to develop themselves has been a big capital for further teacher quality improvement. This is inseparable from the political movement of issuing a new approach to school management by implementing school-based management and the new curriculum, as indicated in the introduction, through which teachers are encouraged to be more active and innovative in their roles as the most influential education stakeholder on students' achievement.

4. Conclusion: after half a century of quantitative expansion, a need for quality enhancement

Teacher education in Indonesia has developed over time from pre-independence to post-independence up until this reform era. Since the very beginning, its development has been marked by fluctuation of improvement. With the strict government control and its

policy of restriction and segmentation, at the time of the Dutch occupation, teacher education was effectively developed to meet the demand for teachers, for both the Dutch schools and *pribumi* schools. When the massive schooling started in the eras of Japanese occupation, the Old Order, the New Order, and the Reformation, the needs for qualified teachers have been hardly met, despite the currently low STR as discussed above. The low STR does not indicate the quality of teachers, but only the quantity. So, teacher education in Indonesia must be improved in a way of fulfilling the need for qualified teachers in every region and district in the country. To do so, several measures can be taken. First, all LPTKs should work together to develop shared visions and minimum standards and competencies for their students (teacher candidates) to achieve. Channels of communication should be established to bridge these different institutions. Second, private institutions for teacher education which have mushroomed for the last decades should be monitored very closely to ensure their quality process and outcomes. Current arrangements for monitoring and evaluation through the existing Kopertis (Coordination of Private Universities) seem not effective. National Board for Accreditation (BAN) should be more active in encouraging private universities and colleges to be assessed for accreditation regularly. Third, there should be a comprehensive review on the teacher upgrading programmes done by the government in conjunction with LPTKs, since these programmes have been mainly intended by teachers to obtain certificates, and hence their qualification. Refinement of the arrangements including the teaching learning processes, the evaluation system, and the study leave arrangement should be done in order to have more effective programmes. Fourth, continuous in-service training or professional development should be imposed as an ethos and culture for teachers. This can be done through a programme of the teacher certificate renewal, which requires teachers to submit their portfolios regularly. Alternatively, the existing promotion system of teachers should be revised to have an implication on their certificates. This is to "force" them to strive for good performance. Another method is to empower the KKG and MGMP (teacher support groups) to be an effective place for teachers to communicate, share, discuss, and improve their knowledge and skills in teaching. Finally, non-civil servant teachers should deserve serious attention from both central and local governments in terms of their welfare, competencies, and future security. Currently, many have regarded non-civil servant teaching only an escape from unemployment.

References

Azra, A. (2002). Pendidkan Kritis, Demokrasi, dan Civil Society. In A. Syahid & A. Al-Jauhari (Eds.), *Bahasa, Pendidikan, dan Agama: 65 Tahun Prof. Dr. Muljanto Sumardi*. Jakarta: Logos.

Bandur, A. (2008). *A Study of The Implementation of School-Based Management in Flores Primary Schools in Indonesia*. Unpublished PhD, The University of Newcastle, Australia, Newcastle.

Bjork, C. (2003). Local Responses to Decentralisation Policy in Indonesia. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(2), 184-216.

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian Education: Teachers, Schools, and Central Bureaucracy*. New York: Routledge.

Bjork, C. (ed.) (2006). *Educational Decentralization: Asian Experiences and Conceptual Contributions*. Dorcrecht: Springer.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2003a). *Kurikuum Berbasis Kompetensi*. Retrieved 24 December, 2003, from http://www.puskur.or.id/..

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2003b). *Pengelolaan Kurikulum 2004 di Tingkat Sekolah*. Pelayanan Profesional Kurikulum 2004 Retrieved 19 September, 2005, from http://www.puskur.or.id.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (2003c). *Undang-Undang Sistim Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2003*. Retrieved 10 August, 2003, from http://www.depdiknas.go.id.

Djajadiningrat, R.L. n.d. From Illiteracy to University: educational development in the Netherlands Indies. *Bulletin 3 of the Netherlands and Netherlands Indies Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations*.

Duflo, E. (2004). The medium run effects of educational expansion: evidence from a large school construction programme in Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 74, 163-197.

Duncan-Poitier, J. (2007). *Teacher Certification*. Education Next, Sprirg.

Feith, H. (1963). Dynamics of Guided Democracy. In R. T. McVey (Ed.), *Indonesia*. New Haven: Southeast Asian Studies, Yale University.

Hanson, E.M. (2006). Strategies of Educational Decentralization: Key Questions and Core Issues. In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational Decentralization: Asian Experiences and Conceptual Contributions* (pp. 9-25). Dordrech: Springer.

Hochschild, J. & Scovronick, N. (2002). Democratic Education and the American Dream: One, Some, and All. In: W.C. Parker (ed.). *Education for Democracy: Contexts, Curriculum, Assessment*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Jalal, F. & Hendarman (2009). *Teacher Deployment and Employment in Indonesia*. Jakarta: The World Bank in cooperation with the MNE.

Jalal, F., Samani, M., Chang, M.C., Stevenson, R., Ragatz, A.B. & Negara, S.D. (2009). *Teacher Certification: A Strategy for Teacher Quality Improvement*. Jakarta: The Ministry of National Education and The World Bank.

Kompas (May 21, 2008). PTN Eks IKIP Diminati - Biaya Murah Menjadi Pertimbangan. *Harian Kompas*, p. 12.

Lee, K.H. (1995). *Education and Politics in Indonesia 1945-1965*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Nielsen, H.D. (2003). Reforms to Teacher Education in Indonesia: does more mean better? In: E. R. Beauchamp (ed.). *Comparative Education Reader*. New York: Routledge Falmer: 391-410.

Pembaruan, S. (April 10, 2003). Perubahan IKIP Menjadi Universitas Tidak Dipahami. *Suara Pembaruan*, p. 7.

Poerbakawatja, S. (1970). *Pendidikan Dalam Alam Indonesia Merdeka*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.

Purwadi, A. & Muljoatmojo, H. 2000. Education in Indonesia: Coping with Challenges in the Third Millennium. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 1(1): 79-102.

Raihani (2007a). Education reforms in Indonesia in the twenty-first century. *International Education Journal*, 8(1): 172-183.

Raihani (2007b). (28 February, 2007). Problematika Sertifikasi Guru. *Riau Pos*.

Raihani (2007c). *Successful School Leadership in Indonesia: A Study of Principals' Leadership in Successful Senior Secondary Schools in Yogyakarta*. Pekanbaru: SUSKA Press.

Rubiannor, T. (2003). *Peran Kepala Sekolah SMU 1 Marabahan Dalam Perspektif Pengembangan Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah di Kabupaten Barito Kuala*. Unpublished Masters, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta.

Suminto no, B. (2009). *Decentralized Centralism: School-based management policies and practices at State Secondary Schools in Mataram, Lombok, Indonesia*. Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Sutjipto, Supriadi, D., Musthafa, B., Mansyur, H., Soenarya, E., Suwarni, E., et al. (2001). Rekomendasi-rekomendasi Untuk Pemberdayaan Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan. In F. Jalal & D. Supriadi (eds.), *Reformasi Pendidikan dalam Konteks Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Adicita: 219-289.

Tilaar, H.A.R. (2000). *Paradigma Baru Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Tim Independen Konsorsium Sertifikasi Guru (2008). *Laporan Monitoring dan Evaluasi (MONEV) Sertifikasi Guru dalam Jabatan Melalui Portofolio 2006-2008*. Jakarta: Dirjen Pendidikan Tinggi - Ministry of National Education.

Trianto & Tutik, T.T. (2007). *Sertifikasi Guru dan Upaya Peningkatan Kualifikasi, Kompetensi & Kesejahteraan*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka.

Umaedi (1999). *Manajemen Peningkatan Mutu Berbasis Sekolah*. Retrieved 10 November, 2003, from http://perkembangan.net/directori.html

Van der Veur, P.W. (1969). *Education and Social Change in Colonial Indonesia (I)*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Southeast Asia Program.

Wong, J.L.-n. (2006). The Effects of Local Intrepretation of Decentralization Policy on School Autonomy in Guangdong Province of China. In: C. Bjork (ed.). *Educational Decentralization: Asian Experiences and Conceptual Contributions*. Dordrecht: Springer, 43-58.

Yamin, H.M. (2006). *Sertifikasi Profesi Keguruan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.